REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, and 19 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-20 are respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,926,117 to Nevill ("*Nevill I*"), U.S. Patent No. 4,945,302 to Janum ("*Janum*"), U.S. Patent No. 6,114,868 to Nevill ("*Nevill II*"), or U.S. Patent No. 6,157,201 to Leung, Jr. ("*Leung*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,782,291 to Blandin ("*Blandin*") or U.S. Patent No. 6,169,409 to Amemiya ("*Amemiya*"). The Office Action rejects Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13, 15-17, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,451,884 to Sauerland ("*Sauerland*"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531,

534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

As an initial matter, the Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action contains no explanation of how many of the cited references allegedly anticipate the claims. As described below, many of these references fail to even mention several elements of the claims. The Applicant respectfully requests that any future Office Action specifically identify the basis for asserting that a cited reference anticipates particular elements in the claims.

Nevill I recites a two-piece burn-in board used during semiconductor testing. (*Abstract*). The burn-in board may be placed in an "environmental chamber." (*Col. 2, Lines 65-68*).

Nevill I lacks any mention of using an "air machine" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. *Nevill I* also lacks any mention that an air machine is associable with a "housing" to form "an at least substantially air-tight chamber" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. In particular, *Nevill I* lacks any mention that the environmental chamber is associable with an air machine to form an "at least substantially air-tight chamber." As a result, *Nevill I* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Janum recites a method and circuit for performing tests during burn-in of integrated circuits. (*Abstract*). The integrated circuits are tested individually and continuously, and the integrated circuits are cyclically tested at extreme temperatures. (*Abstract*). The integrated circuits may be tested in a "climate chamber" having "hot and cold regions." (*Col. 2, Lines 24-31*).

Janum lacks any mention of using an "air machine" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. *Janum* also lacks any mention that an air machine is associable with a "housing" to form "an at

least substantially air-tight chamber" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. While *Janum* mentions a climate chamber, *Janum* fails to recite that the climate chamber is associable with an air machine to form an "at least substantially air-tight chamber." Based on this, *Janum* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Nevill II recites a method and apparatus for maintaining a uniform temperature of semiconductor devices on a burn-in board. (*Abstract*). A cover is placed on the burn-in board so that non-uniform air flow is prevented when the burn-in board is heated in an oven. (*Abstract*). An air flow device (element 33) is used to produce an air flow through the oven, which helps the upper and lower portions of the oven to have similar temperatures. (*Col. 2, Lines 32-41*).

Nevill II recites the use of an air flow device. However, *Nevill II* lacks any mention that the air flow device is operable to "controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. *Nevill II* also lacks any mention that the air flow device is associable with a "housing" to form "an at least substantially air-tight chamber" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. In particular, *Nevill II* lacks any mention that the air flow device is associable with the oven so that the oven forms "an at least substantially air-tight chamber." As a result, *Nevill II* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Leung recites a burn-in system for integrated circuits that generates stimuli for the integrated circuits within a burn-in chamber. (*Abstract*). A stimuli generator in the burn-in chamber includes a robust integrated circuit, allowing the stimuli generator to withstand the temperature or other stresses within the chamber. (*Col. 4, Lines 1-10*).

Leung lacks any mention of using an "air machine" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13.

Leung also lacks any mention that an air machine is associable with a "housing" to form "an at least substantially air-tight chamber" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. While *Leung* mentions a burn-in chamber, *Leung* fails to recite that the burn-in chamber is associable with an air machine to form an "at least substantially air-tight chamber." Based on this, *Leung* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Blandin recites a system for testing electrical components in a sub-zero environment. (*Abstract*). Dry, cooling gas is supplied to a test chamber, and the electrical components are cooled in the chamber. (*Abstract*). Once cooled, the electrical components are inserted into a test head and tested. (*Col. 4, Lines 28-32*).

Blandin lacks any mention of an "air machine" that is operable to "controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. While *Blandin* recites that gas is supplied to a chamber, *Blandin* lacks any mention that the gas is supplied by a source capable of controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow. As a result, *Blandin* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Amemiya recites a method and prober for low-temperature wafer testing. (*Abstract*). The prober includes a "chunk" inside a chamber, where the chunk is capable of cooling a wafer to a low temperature. (*Col. 2, Lines 25-34*). Gas within the chamber and in a space outside the chamber is then replaced with dry gas. (*Abstract*).

Amemiya lacks any mention of an "air machine" that is operable to "controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. While *Amemiya* recites that a mechanism is used to supply a "dry gas" to a chamber, *Amemiya* lacks any mention that the dry

gas is supplied by a source capable of controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow. As a result, *Amemiya* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

Sauerland recites a system for testing electronic components. (*Col. 1, Lines 7-8*). The electronic components are placed in a cooling chamber, and cool air is blown through a central port of the chamber to cool the components. (*Col. 6, Lines 5-17*). Once cooled, the components are tested. (*Col. 6, Lines 18-26*). After that test, a heating coil heats the air in the chamber to a higher temperature, and the test is repeated. (*Col. 6, Lines 27-33*).

Sauerland lacks any mention of an "air machine" that is operable to "controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow" as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13. *Sauerland* simply recites that cool air is provided to a test chamber, and the air is later warmed within the chamber itself. *Sauerland* lacks any mention that the "cool air" is supplied by a source capable of controllably provide a thermally-varying air flow. As a result, *Sauerland* fails to anticipate these elements of Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims).

For these reasons, all of the cited references fail to anticipate the Applicant's invention as recited in Claims 1, 7, and 13 (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections and full allowance of Claims 1-20.

II. CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the remaining claims in the application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests an early allowance of such claims.

SUMMARY

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting prosecution of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Dec. 16, 2003

William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

Docket Clerk
P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
Tel: (972) 628-3600
Fax: (972) 628-3616
E-mail: *wmunck@davismunck.com*